

Optimization

“Coding Standards? or Manual Optimization?”

Optimization

- Minor changes in how a program is written can make a large difference in how the code is optimized.
- Trade offs between
 - Code readability, maintainability, memory management
- Compiler optimization
 - should not alter program behavior

Example

```
void foo1(int* p, int* q){  
    *p += *q;  
    *p += *q;  
}
```

$$*p = 4 * (*q)$$

```
void foo2(int* p, int* q){  
    *p += 2*(*q);  
}
```

$$*p = 3 * (*q)$$

- are foo1 and foo2 equivalent?
 - Memory aliasing

Optimizing Code

- Two ways to optimize
 - **Let the compiler do the optimization**
 - Use: `gcc -O file.c -o file`
Eg: `for (i=0;i<10000;i++)`
 `for (j=0;j<i; j++) { i++; i--;}`
 runs factor x times faster when compiled with -O flag.
 - **Programmer optimized code**
 - Identify code that can be manually optimized
- We will look some examples of manual optimization

Reduce Variable Scope

```
int bad (void) {  
    int i; int j;  
    for (i=0; i<500; i++)  
        { j = foo();  
          if (j > 0)  
              return (j);  
        }  
    return (0);  
}
```

```
int good (void) {  
    int i;  
    for (i=0; i<500; i++)  
        { int j;  
          j = foo();  
          if (j)  
              return (j);  
        } return (0);  
}
```

Compiler can optimize better if the scope of a variable is narrow

Using Natural Sized Variables

```
int foo ( ) {  
    short i= 200, j;  
    for (j = 0; j <100; j++)  
        if (i == j)  
            i = i / j ;  
    return i;  
}
```

```
int foo2(void) {  
    int i = 200;  
    for (i=0; i<100; i++)  
        if (i== j)  
            i /= j;  
    return i;  
}
```

In foo, the division $i = i/j$ is performed in int mode. So I must be extended from say 16-bit to 32-bits. Also the comparison $(i == j)$ requires type conversions.

In foo2, these problems are taken care of. This is an example of trading memory for speed.

Arrange data fields better in a struct

- That is, bigger fields first

Eg: struct {

long int x;

short int y;

short int z;

};

Why? For optimal alignment for compactness and reduced access times.

Optimizing the code

Compare following codes:

```
void foo( int *data ) {  
    int i;  
    for(i=0; i<N; i++)  
        { foo2( *data, i); }  
}
```

```
void foo( int *data ) {  
    int i;  
    int localdata = *data;  
    for(i=0; i<N; i++) {  
        foo2( localdata, i);  
    }  
}
```

Why is this better? If we assume that local data is never changed, it is better to leave it as a local variable. Otherwise it will be copied every time the function foo2 is called (since data is referenced by a pointer)

Optimization ctd...

Use unsigned and/or register integers when you can
Faster arithmetic with some processors. Also good for bit operations

register unsigned int x = 10;

Combine loops:

for (I = 0 ; I < N; I++) task1();

for (I = 0 ; I < N; I++) task2();

If we assume task1 and task2 are independent tasks (task2 doesn't depend on a result from task1)

Better: for (I = 0 ; I < N; I++) { task1(); task2(); }

Loop unroll

for (I=0; I<3; I++) x(I);

Better:

x(0); x(1); x(2);

for (i=0; i<n; i+=2)

c[i] = A[i] + B[i]

c[i+1] = A[i+1] + B[i+1]

Optimization ctd...

Faster Loops

```
for( i=0; i<N; i++){ ... }
```

Better:

for(i=10; i--;) { ... } -- if order does not matter. It is better to say is 1 non-zero than checking i-N non zero. most target processors will provide decrement-and-branch-if-zero type functionality into their instruction sets

When possible pass a structure by reference

all rem

Break from a loop early if possible

Trade memory for speed

Switch instead of if-else-if

If last case is required in if-then-else then it will test all conditions before getting there. So switch is better

Move unmodified variables out of the loop

```
int foo(int x, int y){  
    int I;  
    for (I=0; I<10; I++)  
        { sum = I + x*y; }  
}
```

if ()

else ()

!

Switch ()

Case "1" ; —
break

Case "2" ; —
break

Optimization ctd...

Single dimensional arrays are faster than multidimensional.

$A[I][j] = *(*A + n * I + j)$ $I = 1..m, J = 1..n$

Better:

$A[I] = *(*A + I)$ $I = 1.....mn$

Floating point multiplication is faster than division.

Use: $x * 0.5$ instead of $x * 1.0 / 2$; or $x / 2$

Use macros whenever possible. Function calls are expensive

Addition is quicker than multiplication

~~$\#define \max(a, b) ((a) > (b) ? a : b)$~~

Avoid using `sqrt` if possible. It is an expensive function.

If $(\text{sqrt}(x) < 3)$

Better:

If $(x * x < 9)$

$\text{int } z = \max(x, y)$

$\text{int } z = (x > y ? x : y);$

~~$\text{int } \max(\text{int } x, \text{int } y) \{$~~
if $(x > y)$ return x ;
else return y ;
 ~~$\}$~~

Overwriting functions

- We can overwrite standard library functions such as sqrt and printf
- But you need to know the exact signature of the standard library function
- An Example

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <math.h>
int printf(const char* s, ...){ int x = 1;}
double sqrt(double x){ return x*x;}
int main(void){
    int x = 3;
    if ( x == 0 ) printf("%3d\n", x+1);
    else printf("%.3f\n", sqrt(x-1));
    return 0;
}
```

A ⊕ B